REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-44 were originally presented for consideration in this application. No claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, claims 1-44 are currently pending in this application.

The following rejections were set forth in the Office Action:

- 1. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 17, 18, 22-24, 29-32, 35-37 and 44 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,996 to Kyle et al.;
- 2. Claims 6, 7, 12-16, 25-28, 33, 34 and 43 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kyle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,899,178 to Tubel;
- 3. Claims 10, 19-21, 41 and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kyle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,626,248 to Roberts et al.;
- 4. Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kyle in view of art described in the specification; and
- 5. Claims 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kyle in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,314,365 to Petersen et al.

Regarding the anticipation rejections based on the Kyle reference, please note that the independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended above to make it clear that the signal converter, in which the acoustic signal is converted to a non-acoustic signal, is fixedly interconnected as a part of the tubing string. In contrast, Kyle describes an

acoustic to electrical signal conversion being made in a probe reciprocably suspended within a tubing string.

As stated by the examiner in section 2, page 1 of the Detailed Action of the

October 6, 2006 Office Action, the probe 32 described by Kyle is not fixedly connected

to the tubing structure. Therefore, Kyle does not anticipate the amended claims 1 or 18,

and the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of these claims

and their dependents.

Regarding the obviousness rejections, as discussed above, the Kyle reference does

not describe the features of the invention now recited in the amended independent

claims 1 and 18. Therefore, the limitations of the dependent claims which are rejected

as being obvious over the Kyle reference combined with other references are also not

described, and the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the obviousness

rejections.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all of the claims pending in

this application are now seen to be in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance

of claims 1-44 is therefore earnestly solicited.

The examiner is hereby requested to telephone the undersigned attorney of

record at (972) 516-0030 if such would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH IP SERVICES, P.C.

Marlin R. Smith

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 38,310

PATENT Attorney Docket No.:2002IP008036

Dated: December 26, 2006

660 North Central Expressway Suite 230 Plano, Texas 75074 (972) 516-0030

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

on				